

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. In the non-final Office Action of March 23, 2005, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Objected to claim 12.
- B.) Rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.
- C.) Rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12-14, 18, 20, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Dulude, et al.*
- D.) Rejected claims 3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 19, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Dulude, et al.* in view of *Diffie, et al.*
- E.) Rejected claims 4, 5, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dulude, et al.* in view of *Ginter, et al.*

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner's disposition below.

A.) Objected to claim 12.

Claim 12 has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

Applicants respectfully submit the objection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim 12 has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12-14, 18, 20, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Dulude, et al.*

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 13, and 24 each claim subject matter relating to executing person authentication by comparing a template acquired from a person identification certificate storing a template which is person identification data of a user using an information processing apparatus with sampling information input by the user, and issuing a verification certificate provided that said person authentication is successfully passed.

This is clearly unlike *Dulude*, which fails to disclose or even suggest a verification certificate that is issued provided that a person authentication is successfully passed. Nowhere

does *Dulude* even suggest a verification certificate. Therefore, for at least this reason, *Dulude* fails to disclose or even suggest claims 1, 13, and 24.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20, and 22 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 13 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 13 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejected claims 3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 19, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Dulude, et al.* in view of *Diffie, et al.*

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over *Dulude* as discussed above. *Diffie* still fails to disclose or suggest a verification certificate that is issued provided that a person authentication is successfully passed. Therefore, claims 1 and 13 are allowable over *Dulude* in view of *Diffie*.

Claims 3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 19, 21, and 23 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 13 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 13 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

E.) Rejected claims 4, 5, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dulude, et al.* in view of *Ginter, et al.*

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over *Dulude* as discussed above. *Ginter* still fails to disclose or suggest a verification certificate that is issued provided that a person authentication is successfully passed. Therefore, claims 1 and 13 are allowable over *Dulude* in view of *Ginter*.


Claims 4, 5, 16, and 17 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 13 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 13 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-24 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHNEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)